



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/053,753 01/22/2002		Lester F. Lau	05031.003.CNUS02	6127	
22930 7590 07/22/2005			EXAM	INER	
HOWREY LLP			WOITACH, JOSEPH T		
C/O IP DOCK	ETING DEPARTMENT				
	W PARK DR, SUITE 20	00	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	CH, VA 22042-2924		1632		

DATE MAILED: 07/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action							
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief							

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/053,753	LAU, LESTER F.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Joseph T. Woitach	1632		

before the riling of all Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Joseph T. Woitach	1632						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 11 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of								
this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compfollowing time periods:	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (ence, which CFR 41.31; or					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of	•							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b)	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of . ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI	f the final rejection.						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be 	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.					
AMENDMENTS								
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) 	nsideration and/or search (see NO		because					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	•	educing or simplifying	the issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		jected claims. *						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 	•	, timely filed amendm	nent canceling					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ worlded below or appended.	ill be entered and an	explanation of					
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>65 and 67-77</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
 The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet. 	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	ance because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).			_ &					
13. Other:		Toe h	2					
		~/W U						

AU1632

į

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicants argue that the specification provides guidance for making an antibody that specifically binds to human Cyr61 and can be distinguished from the cited art. Applicants arguments have been fully considered but not found persuasive. Upon review of the citation for support of Applicants' arguments, it is noted that the citation is not complete.

"These sequence differences are exploited to elicit antibodies specific to the human Cyr6l by using as an antigen a peptide having a sequence derived from one of the divergent regions in the human protein, although antibodies directed to a conserved region are also contemplated by the invention."

Clearly the specification provides support for using the divergent region(s) of Cyr61, however it clearly teaches that the conservered regions are a contemplated part of the invention as demonstrated by the complete sentence Applicants have cited. Examiner would not contest that differences between the mouse and human Cyr61 sequences exist, rather at issue is what weight the term "specific" should be given in the instantly claimed invention. Presently, the claim is being interpreted to encompass the fact that the antibody will bind Cry61 and not any other protein(s) non-specfically. Further, it should be noted that binding is usually empiracally tested and that the concentration of a given antibody solution and/or washing conditions would affect the "specific" binding of any antibody. Even if claims were to be interpreted to encompass antibodies that only bound the divergent sequence found between mouse and human, it is noted that the only teaching in the present specification is differences between specific mouse and human sequences, and fails to proivde any guidance to sequences from other species and human/. For the reasons above and of record, the rejection is maintained.